DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 114 FL 010 253

AUTHOR	Brent-Palmer, Cora
TITLE	A Sociolinguistic Assessment of the Notion 'Im/migrant Semilingualism' from a Social Conflict Perspective. Working Papers on Bilingualism, No. 17.
INSTITUTION	Ontario Inst. for Studies in Education, Toronto. Bilingual Education Project.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of the Secretary of State, Ottawa (Ontario).
PUB DATE	Apr 79
NOTE	45p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Bilingual Education Project, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 252 Bloor St. West, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1V6 (As long as supply lasts)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Bilingual Education; Code Switching (Language); Cognitive Development; *Cognitive Tests; Cross Cultural Studies; Culture Conflict; Ethnography; Immigrants; Language Attitudes; Language Research; Linguistic Borrowing; *Linguistic Competence; Linguistic Performance; Migrants; Nonstandard Dialects; *Second Language Learning; Social Factors; *Sociocultural Patterns; Socioeconomic Status; *Sociolinguistics; Testing
IDENTIFIERS	*Semilingualism; Threshold Level

ABSTRACT

This study challenges the Toukamaa and Skutnabb-Kangas theory of semilingualism and suggests that an integrated set of sociological and sociolinguistic factors can predict the performance of minority bilinguals in school. Semilingualism is described as a low level of competence in the minority language, a linguistic handicap that prevents the individual from acquiring the linguistic skills appropriate to his original language capacity in any language. Within the framework of a social conflict theory of power, sanctions, and conflict, where there are subordinate and dominant language groups, numerous examples are presented of social class and language-related differences that suggest that existing bilingual education programs neither provide for nor test for ethnolinguistic differences. Because subordinate immigrant language groups develop contact-dialects and non-standard varieties of both the native and the dominant language, instruction in the schools could be built around the vernacular and allow for gradual transition to standard versions of either the native or the dominant language. Conventional researchers from dominant language groups need to take into account sociological and sociolinguistic factors that contribute to subordinate language groups' use of the dominant language. Information is needed for: (1) support for the subordinate languages in education; (2) degree of language shift in the subordinate language community; (3) the contrast between the home language code/performance style and that of the school; and (4) ways that teaching and testing can be changed to accommodate subordinate language-group children. (Author/MHP)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Cora Brent-Palmer
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED171114

FL010253

A SOCIOLINGUISTIC ASSESSMENT OF THE NOTION 'IM/MIGRANT SEMILINGUALISM' FROM A SOCIAL CONFLICT PERSPECTIVE

Cora Brent-Palmer

Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

1. BACKGROUND: THE SEMILINGUAL NOTION AND MINORITY LANGUAGE EDUCATION

The role of the vernacular in language shelter programs for minority groups. The problem of educating large numbers of ethnically and linguistically different students, who form multilingual enclaves in the urban centres of social units which once considered themselves ethnolinguistically monolithic, is an international one. Therefore solutions which seem to provide the possibility of even a minimum of success in one country will have an impact on programs in other countries.

The proposals for bilingual education programs (B.E. programs) based on extensive UNESCO backed research on Swedish migrant populations represent some of the most explicit and theoretically interesting of the various suggestions for the use of the minority language as a vehicle of instruction. Proposed by Toukomaa and Skutnabb-Kangas, (1976,1977; hereafter referred to as T. & S.-K.) the programs aim at avoiding the subtractive type of bilingualism reported for minority populations (Lambert, 1975) with the concomitant risk of negative cognitive development and poor school achievement. Thus, T.& S.-K. (1977: 33-34) chose a model of minority education which according to them is based on the assumption that in order to achieve equal educational opportunity, minority groups must be oriented toward group maintenance through vernacular programs which protect the marked language[1] -- the minority group's mother tongue, and develop it to a point where the addition of the host unmarked language does not result in a psychological and cognitive disadvantage to the minority learner. The Language Shelter Program grew out of this assumption. (T.& S.-K., 1977: 33-34).

According to T. & S.-K. (1977:2) Finnish migrant children's low competency in the mother tongue -- their 'semilingualism' (see below for a definition of this term) has become:

> The focal point [. . .] of the Scandinavian dialogue concerning the education of migrants. Recognition of this fact, which is substantiated by a number of empirical studies [. . .] forms the basis of Sweden's far-reaching reforms in education policy.

In order to erase L1 semilingualism and achieve the development of solid L1 speaking and writing skills, T. & S.-K. (1976:84) propose that all minority groups which are numerically large enough should be taught in the marked L1 throughout the early school years, starting at the preschool level and continuing up through the late elementary years when the children are from 10 to 12 years old (T. & S.-K., 1977 :67). Even though during this time they would be encouraged to play with majority-group peers and communicate with them in the majority-L during school break, all pedagogical situations would be in the migrant

children's L1 (ibid.). The unmarked majority language -- the L2 -- would be introduced slowly: taught in the late elementary years as a subject. Further, instruction in the majority L2 would initially be restricted to the oral language; L2 literacy would be introduced only after the students possessed a high degree of oral proficiency in the language.

In this type of B.E. program, the students would not be able to use the unmarked L2 --the majority L-- as a medium of instruction in subjects that require a relatively high level of literacy until they were around 12 to 14 years old. In Canada, this would place them in the junior to early high school grades, before they were able to receive instruction via the majority L English, or French in Quebec.

Problems with the language shelter bilingual program. The length of time spent in schooling through the minority vernacular makes the Language Shelter Program different in crucial ways from both majority and minority B.E. programs elsewhere.[2] Thus although there are several formats of B.E. for minority populations, and instruction in all of them is introduced first in the marked L, the student's L1 (c.f. Engels, 1975; Paulston, 1974; & Handscombe, 1978), most programs of this type differ from the Swedish proposals in both the length of time devoted to the L1 and the grade level at which the unmarked L2 becomes the medium of instruction. For example, in Canada almost all of the minority vernacular programs are transitional; the vernacular is used for a short period of time during the first two years of schooling (Handscombe, 1978). By grade three all instruction is in the unmarked L2 which is usually the majority L. At this point, the L1 is phased out. Further, in contrast to the focus on literacy found in the Swedish proposals, in these transitional programs little or no literacy in the L1 is planned (c.f. Handscombe, 1978; Toronto Board of Education, 1976; Vancouver School Board, 1975).

T. & S.-K. (1977: 34-36) claim that transitional B.E. programs lead to low proficiency in both the L1 and the L2 because they do not provide enough time for the development of L1 oral skills to optimal 'threshold level,' a point at which the introduction of the majority, unmarked L2 will not have negative effects. In fact for T. & S.-K. (1977: 34-36) monoliterate (i.e. oral only) transitional programs for minority children automatically result in low proficiency in the L1, and future school failure in the majority L.

This is a strong claim, and if true, predicts the failure of all transitional B.E. programs in Canada which have the primary goal of increasing the minority child's chances for coping with the majority L of the school by first introducing instruction in the vernacular. (See Ashworth, 1975; Toronto Board of Education, 1976). However, given the linguistic diversity of the minority groups in Canada and their various types of L-problems, as well as the expense involved in materials development and teacher training for vernacular education that stresses literacy skills for even a few of these minority groups,[3] B.E. programs with the L-shelter type of format would pose staggering problems in the Canadian context. Since such programs could involve between 30 to 50

per cent of the school population in some urban centres,[4] a total reorientation in educational policy and practice at all levels of the school system would be necessary.

Before proposals for B.E. programs of the L-shelter type are developed for Canadian minority groups, educators should be certain that the strong claims made for the program are solidly founded. Therefore, it is necessary to take a close look at the research and theoretical assumptions on which the L-shelter proposals rest.

The research base. Proposals for the L-Shelter Program are derived from three major findings in the Scandinavian research on Finnish minority school children in Sweden. Based on their performance on standardized tests in both Finnish and Swedish, T. & S.-K. found:

(1) A low level of L1 proficiency: Researchers (Särkelä & Kuusinen, 1976, reported in Paulston 1977: 160; T. & S.-K. 1976: 53, 75-78; 1977: 1-2) found that Finnish migrant children in Sweden had a lower proficiency in Finnish, as measured on standardized tests, than the lowest 10% of their Finnish peers in Finland with whom they were matched on two characteristics: social class and grade level;

(2) A relationship between L1 and L2 proficiency: T. & S.-K. (1977: 1-2) found that those Finnish migrant children in Sweden with the lowest proficiency scores in their L1 also had the lowest proficiency scores in Swedish;

(3) An interrelationship between L1 proficiency, cognitive development, and school achievement: T. & S.-K. (1976:161) found that those Finnish migrant children in Sweden who had a low proficiency in the L1 also had low grades in upper-level mathematics, biology, chemistry, and physics indicating what they considered to be low conceptualization at the abstract level needed for success in these subjects.

Although the Finnish migrant children who were educated via Swedish performed the worst on the above, the findings were significant even for those migrant children enrolled in a transitional Finnish vernacular program.

The theoretical issue: Semilingualism and the threshold hypothesis. In order to explain the above research findings, several researchers (c.f. Paulston 1977: 148; T. & S.-K. 1977: 27-28) have relied on two hypotheses posited by Cummins (1976, 1978 a,b.). One of the hypotheses, termed the 'developmental interdependence hypothesis,' states that:

> *[. . .]* the development of skills in a second language is a function of skills already developed in the first language. In situations where the mother tongue is inadequately developed, the introduction and promotion of a second language can impede the continued development of the first. In turn the inadequate development of L1 skills will limit the development of competence in the L2 (Cummins 1978a: 396).

This hypothesis has been used by T. & S.-K. (1977: 28) to explain findings (1) and (2) above.

The other hypothesis posited by Cummins (1976:1) -- the 'threshold hypothesis' -- states that:

> *[. . .]* there may be a threshold level of linguistic competence which a bilingual child must attain both in order to avoid cognitive deficits and allow the potentially beneficial aspects of becoming bilingual to influence his cognitive functioning. (ibid.).

Within the framework of these hypotheses T. & S.-K. (1977: 27-28) claim that the findings can be partially explained by the notion of semi-lingualism -- this they define as a low level of competence in the minority L1 that produces a:

> *[. . .]* linguistic handicap which prevents the individual from acquiring the linguistic skill appropriate to his original linguistic capacity in any language. (T. & S.-K., 1976:20).

A more in-depth analysis of the semilingual notion reveals that T. & S.-K. associate it with very specific aspects of linguistic competence. Thus, for them, linguistic competence seems to be a highly abstract, qualitative factor which they relate to what they consider to be the more universal aspects of language: understanding the meaning of abstract concepts and synonyms, and mastery of the cognitive and decontextualized uses of language. See T. & S.-K. (1976:20-22).

Cummins (1979: 15,33) who seems to give some credence to the semi-lingual notion, especially as it relates to the acquisition of reading skills, also suggests that "linguistic competence" is related to complex cognitive operations such as the ability to carry out verbal analogies, understand a variety of abstract concepts through the use of a wide vocabulary, and process highly decontextualized language. Thus, if I understand Cummins and T. & S.-K. correctly, semilingualism is the low level of L-competence which impedes the continued development of the L1, limits the development of L2 competence, promotes cognitive deficiency and a low level of school achievement. Such a notion leads quite logically to proposals for the L-shelter type of B.E. program which insists on the sequence L1 before L2 and delays the introduction of the L2 until after the development of the 'threshold level' of competence in the L1 has been

assured.

Problems with the semilingual notion. Despite the claim that societal factors are primary in determining semilingualism, (c.f. T. & S.-K., 1976:22), the emphasis on the linguistic antecedents is based on a theoretical orientation which deemphasizes societal factors.

The minority child's level of mother-tongue competence developed in the home environment is regarded as the predictor of the level of cognitive functioning that the child brings to school, and as conditioning the type of interaction that (s)he has with the educational environment. (ibid.)

As will be demonstrated below, this linguistic orientation is not within the paradigm of either sociological (Fishman 1976, 1977) or socio- and ethnolinguistic (John, 1973; Kochman, 1972; Phillips, 1972) models of minority education. Given the success of these sociologically based theories in accounting for minority populations' low school achievement, the linguistically oriented rationale for the Language Shelter Program with its key concept 'semilingualism' is quite exceptional and should be examined closely.

Problems with existing sociological models of bilingual education. Like T. & S.-K., several researchers in the sociological framework also treat school factors as a dependent variable in determining the medium of instruction for low-class minority populations. However contrary to the 'linguistic approach' taken by T. & S.-K., these researchers assign a primary causal role to a set of societal factors (SES, language prestige etc.) which they view as the determining antecedents of school achievement for language related skills. See Fishman (1976) and Paulston (1976) for examples.

In my opinion, Cummins' (1976: 9; 1987b:15, 1979) criticism of these macro-sociological approaches is well founded. I agree with his claim that most researchers within these orientations do not attempt to explain how macro social factors (i.e. economic, power conflict, social class etc.) translate into actual L-behaviours at the micro level in ways that could account for low test scores and poor performance in everyday classroom interaction.

I would like to suggest, however, that the supposed semilingualism noted in the Finnish research could be explained without recourse to notions of linguistic levels of competence if macro-sociological factors such as SES and 'power' are expanded to include (a) microlevel analysis of the social interaction between subordinate and dominant groups, and (b) sociolinguistic research on language variability. In my view, the elaboration of such an expanded sociological framework is not a sterile, academic exercise in 'model building,' but will hopefully clarify, in some critical way, the notion of apparent minority semilingualism and serve to pinpoint some of the underlying causes of the consistently low L-related performance reported for ethnolinguistically different minority students. Most important, such an undertaking should provide a more socially realistic approach to the evaluation of the strong claims made

for the Language Shelter type of program.

The next two sections of this paper will be devoted to the elaboration of an expanded sociological framework of the kind outlined above. A concluding section will then attempt to demonstrate how the various sociological factors taken together can account for the minority child's low level of achievement in school and on tests.

2. AN INTEGRATED SOCIOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK FOR INVESTIGATING THE SOCIOLINGUISTIC ANTECEDENTS OF MINORITY L-EDUCATION

Macro-sociology: Language, power, and normative behaviour. Two sociological approaches seem to be relevant to an investigation of the social antecedents of minority L-development. One of them -- social conflict theory -- has received attention from several researchers into B.E. (Paulston 1977), and the other -- symbolic interactionism[5] -- has been used as a framework for the study of the school failure of L-related skills of minority bidialectal children in the U.S. (c.f. McDermott 1974). To my knowledge, this is the first time these two approaches have been united in a study of the language related antecedents of B.E.

Social conflict theory revolves around three basic constructs: power, sanctions, and conflict,[6] and is sometimes called Power-conflict theory (Schermerhorn, 1970: 39-50). Multi-ethnic social units are the main type of social situation investigated by this approach.

For sociologists who work within the conflict paradigm of inter-ethnic relations, the unequal distribution of power among different ethnic groups within a social unit is the foundation element of the stratification system holding between groups (c.f. Barth, 1969; Hughes & Kallen, 1974; Lenski, 1966).

In a multi-ethnic social unit, ethnic groups have different assets (e.g. cultural behaviours and values, economic and political strength). Each group can be characterized in terms of this control (ibid.): dominant (D) ethnic groups are those which control the access to the major institutions and socially valued assets; subordinate (S) groups have little or no power.

In multi-ethnic social units which are also multilingual, language is one of the most important social assets (c.f. Deutsch, 1975; Jackson, 1977; Marden & Meyer, 1968: 26); and the D-ethnolinguistic group's power is evidenced by its ability to:

(1) Prescribe the L-behaviour and opinions about L for itself and all other groups within the socio-economic unit (i.e. one group's "legitimatizing power" (Deutsch, 1975);

(2) Serve as the major reference group and model for all other ethnolinguistic groups' L-behaviour because its L is the most valued: i.e. the L-group has 'attraction power' (c.f. Mackay, 1972);

(3) Mobilize the social forces of the major social institutions -- the economy, education system, government, legal system, and in some cases the military -- in support of the implementation of its L-policy. (Kelman, 1971: 21-27).

In my opinion, the way in which a D-group exercises its power prerogatives -- especially its legitimizing power -- creates a direct impact on the S-group's L-code, performance style, and the socio-psychological climate of intergroup relations. In this way the D-group contributes to the conditions of mother tongue learning and the cognitive development of the S-child.

A D-group's legitimizing power is carried out by two types of L-policy:

(1) Status planning: The selection of an official language from two or more languages in the social unit. (c.f. Fishman, 1974; Paulston, 1974: 6);

(2) Corpus planning: The selection of one norm of several competing varieties of the official language (c.f. ibid.)

Seen within the framework of conflict theory, L-status policy is undertaken when D-ethnolinguistic groups, who control the decision-making positions in the social unit, consolidate their advantage by making a language that only they are proficient in (e.g. English for educated Nigerians) the official L of the upper levels of the economy and government (e.g. English in Nigeria, India etc.), and if possible at all levels of education (e.g. English in the U.S. and English-Canada, etc.). See Deutsch (1975); Fishman (1974). As long as D groups also withhold official status from the other L(s) in the social unit (Kelman, 1971), the L(s) in the S-ethnolinguistic groups have no status in these institutions and receive little or no encouragement for use there (Hughes & Kallen, 1974). In receiving countries, the language of voluntary im/migrants rarely, if ever, receives official recognition.

D-groups also consolidate their legitimizing power through a series of normative behaviours toward language which are often formalized in a corpus policy. (c.f. Fishman, 1974). In multilingual societies D-groups maintain control over the L-norms of the social unit by choosing a standard reference variety of the official L whose norms are given positive valuation and prestige.

The visibility of L-behaviour which deviates from the standard reference norm is accentuated by the fact that D-groups usually formalize the reference standard so that the prescribed L-behaviour associated with it becomes highly salient for the members of the society and can be used as a yardstick against which all groups in the social unit can be evaluated. (Brent 1974, Marden & Meyer 1968: 21-26). This is legitimized in the following ways by:

(1) Institutional statutory norms which are usually based on the idealized written variety of the standard L and are expressed in explicit rule

formation. Even though they are only sometimes institutionalized by L-academies (e.g. l'Académie française in France or l'Office de la langue française in Québec) which issue edicts on the 'correct' forms of the L, in literate societies these statutory norms are always formalized in prescriptive grammars which provide the 'linguistic' basis of language arts instruction in the schools (Brent, 1974), and serve as the rationale behind the choice of L-items on tests.

(2) Non-institutional evaluative norms comprise the set of reactions to various degrees of non-compliance with the idealized norm of the standard-L. Usually these evaluative reactions are not statutory but rely on reference L-models drawn from institutions controlled by the educated upper strata of the D-society (i.e. Received Pronunciation, BBC English, American Network English (Giles & Powesland, 1975) and CBC/Radio-Canada (Brent-Palmer, 1977). Teachers' judgements of students' L-behaviour in the school are based on these evaluative reactions to language norms.[10] See Brent-Palmer (1978) for a discussion.

Both (1) and (2) represent varying degrees of idealized beliefs about L which are controlled by D-language groups: neither is based on an 'objective' description of the L and the way it is actually used (Brent, 1974).

In receiving countries the non-standard varieties of the language spoken by the lower-class voluntary im/migrants are usually stigmatized. However, the standard varieties of the voluntary im/migrant languages may be valued even when they have no official status. This is related, in my opinion, to the general tendency for the idealized norms of a standard-L to receive high prestige. Thus all ethnic groups in the social unit view all the standard varieties of all Ls in the unit as being 'superior' to the non-standard varieties.

As with other types of norms in the society, failure to comply results in sanctions being placed on the 'deviant' ethnolinguistic groups, their language and their L-behaviour. In some cases this leads to stigmatization (Giles & Powesland, 1975: Ch. 2; Kochman, 1972; Marden & Meyer, 1968: 21-26; McDermott, 1974: 83-88). In all cases non-compliance is socially marked (Brent-Palmer, 1978: Ch. 5; Labov, 1972b).

Only the language of members from the upper strata of the D-ethnolinguistic group conforms to the official standard L, and in a multilingual social unit most of those who do not conform will be from S-language groups. For example, in a literate society because of the conservative nature of the written language in preserving older, archaic forms of speech, the valued referent standard represents a highly idealized norm familiar only to the educated and upper strata members of the D-group. Most of the other members in the social unit -- both subordinate and dominant -- will have varying degrees of 'deviant' behaviour, which can thus be socially marked. This means that many groups are easy targets for receiving sanctions

from the D-society: they are given failing grades in school and on tests; they are assigned to special courses where their 'deficiences' are treated (c.f. Brent-Palmer, 1974; McDermott, 1974), or they are assigned low-level jobs with no chance for advancement to positions requiring high literacy skills (McDermott, 1974; Shuy, 1973). In this way S-groups are blocked from participation in the socially valued domains of the D-controlled institutions like the school. The impact of this complicated situation on the socio-psychological climate of face-to-face interaction between S- and D-groups is explored below.

Language, Power relations and face-to-face interaction. Several sociologists (Cicourel, 1972; Garfinkel, 1972; Goffman, 1959, 1963, 1972; Jackson, 1977; Leodolter & Leodolter, 1976; Mead, 1962; Tajfel 1974), who have elaborated a theory -- symbolic interactionism -- linking macro-sociological processes and constructs with face-to-face interaction (Cicourel, 1972), explain the interface between macro- and micro-social processes in the following terms:

(1) In- and out-group behaviours are among the most significant entities categorized by humans (Tajfel, 1974), and the meanings of these behaviours are derived from social interaction between individuals in the society (Mead, 1962).

(2) Because of socio-political processes, the value attached to a group and the behaviour of its individual members may be positive and have prestige, or negative and be stigmatized (Cicourel, 1972; Goffman, 1963; Jackson, 1977).

(3) Both positive and negative evaluation -- especially stigmatization -- is attached to all the members of the social category evaluated, and the valuation with the behaviours attached to it are learned during both primary (i.e. in the home) and secondary (i.e. in school) socialization (Goffman, 1963). The valuation is learned as part of appropriate social roles which are submitted to the sanctions of significant others (Mead, 1962). Thus socio-cultural behaviour and valuation becomes a normative, integral part of the social self-image (ibid.), and is associated with a particular life-style (McDermott, 1974: 84-100).

(4) Because the social self-image is also manifested as a syndrome of identifiable behaviour patterns, the status and power differences as they are reflected in social roles and normative behaviour are played out in face-to-face interaction in everyday life situations (Cicourel, 1972; Garfinkel, 1972; Goffman, 1959, 1963). Thus, the individual's behaviour carries social information that can act as status, prestige, or stigmatized symbols (i.e. social markers or stereotypes) during interaction (Goffman, 1963: 41).

In terms of the above, the power configurations holding between groups at the macro-level should be acted out by members of these groups during the "politics of everyday life" (McDermott, 1974: 89). Although language

is not the only social stimulus which conveys symbolic social meaning during interaction, its general visibility makes it one of the most salient social institutions. Thus all communicative acts are an integral part of the macro-socio -political structure (Eakins & Eakins, 1978:1; Jackson, 1977) and during interaction they serve as a shorthand for macro-social processes involving power relations, status roles and social identity (Cicourel 1972; Eakins & Eakins 1978; Goffman 1963; Gumperz, 1971; Jackson, 1977). Further, the tendency to stigmatize S-languages and culture is reflected in asymmetrical communication between S- and D- group members.[11] (Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Jackson, 1977). In situationsof socio-political conflict, the degree of social asymmetry between D- and S-groups can be expressed in specific L-behaviour (c.f. Jackson, 1977) and performance styles. These behaviours are learned during socialization (Farb, 1974).

In the school domain, the interaction between students and teachers in the classroom and in tests will reflect the wider socio-psychological climate, and the social meaning and behaviours associated with the various D- and S-ethnic groups will be acted out during interaction in all school encounters between pupils and teachers/testers.

The aspects of symbolic interactionism described above seem like a natural expression of the way in which social conflict theory can be perceived at the micro-level of analysis. Language can be expected to be both a molder of and molded by this interaction.

In the rest of this paper, the above integrated approach to social conflict theory will be the major orientation toward the study of the socio- and ethnolinguistic determinants of language learning and cognitive development of S-migrant children living in multi-ethnic societies.

3. LINGUISTIC VARIABILITY AND CONSTRASTIVE PERFORMANCE STYLES OF SUBORDINATE AND DOMINANT ETHNIC GROUPS IN CONTACT

Contributions of applied ethno- and sociolinguistics. Research in sociolinguistics and the ethnography of speaking has potential for the clarification and solution of practical language problems precisely in those problem situations which stem from covert conflicts between different linguistic codes and ways of speaking -- conflicts which may be obscured by a failure to see beyond idealized norms of abstract grammatical patterns and the referential functions of language. Understanding the nature of such problem situations is a major step toward their solution (c.f. Bauman & Sherzer, 1974: 12).

Because ethnolinguistic methodology is sensitive to linguistic variability and the social-expressive dimensions of L, it is particularly well equipped to describe differences in ways of using L within ethnolinguistically heterogeneous social units with pedagogically fruitful results. For example, applied sociolinguistic studies comparing the ethnography of speaking in the home and school could lead to an in-depth understanding of the subordinate

child's language background and the mismatch, if any, between his linguistic code and norms of communication on the one hand and those required by the school and on tests on the other (c.f. Brent-Palmer, 1977). Thus, socio/ethnolinguistic research is directly relevant to the investigation of some of the L-related issues raised by T. & S.-K.'s conceptualization of migrant semilingualism.

Given the discussion above on the way in which language is embedded in wider socio-economic processes, one could hypothesize that natural linguistic differences between S- and D- ethnolinguistic groups in contact will be molded by societal power constellations so that linguistically different subordinated groups develop distinctive, highly visible and stigmatized patterns of L-behaviour which children learn during socialization. As a first step in such an investigation, I will look at how aspects of dominant L-power help create, mold and sustain distinctive subordinate linguistic codes and styles of communication.

Attraction power and D-language use by S-groups. In conditions of voluntary contact between im/migrant workers and D-indigenous groups, the impact of the D-language on the S-migrant usually produces a mixed S-dialect which may become the mother tongue of the S-population. This is often accompanied by a gradual generational L-shift away from the S-language to the D-language, and occurs as the result of two types of legitimizing behaviour:

(1) S-migrant populations are under pressure to learn the D-language in order to function in the public domains (Bloomfield, 1933: 462; Weinreich, 1953:1);

(2) S-populations use the D-language in the home domain in the family because of its prestige and attractiveness as a symbol of high status. Thus they emulate the linguistic forms of the D-language (Haugen, 1972: 17, 1977).

There are quite a few cases which demonstrate the attraction of the D-language for migrant populations. Hoffman (1971) reported that newly arrived Puerto Rican immigrant children living in a segregated New York ghetto,who had almost no contact with D-speakers of the standard variety of the L,used English, the D-host group's language, with older siblings and peers in the home and neighbourhood within one year of their arrival. This same phenomenon was reported for recently arrived Mexican migrants in the U.S. Barker, 1942), immigrants in Canada (Gossens, 1973), and Finns in the U.S. (Karttunen, 1977).

The linguistic impact of the D-language on the S-language code. There is evidence that the tendency for S-group members to use the D-language among themselves in the same social domain as the mother tongue results in an extensive amount of interference from the D-language in the S-language. Some of the linguistic parameters of this process have been described.

It seems that the process of borrowing from the D-language follows a similar rule-governed pattern for all S-languages (c.f. Acosta-Belàn, 1975). Thus the evidence shows that lexical and semantic borrowings occur first (ibid.), and the linguistic integration of these into the S-linguistic

system results in changes in the S-phonological and morphological structure in the direction of the D-language (Haugen, 1972: Ch. 4). However, the widespread impact of the D-language on the S-syntax generally occurs later, after a considerable period of contact (ibid.).

Most of the borrowing during the first stages of contact involves the coinage of terms for new items that do not exist in the traditional culture (c.f. Acosta-Belàn 1975; Haugen, 1972: Ch. 4). The large majority of these lexical items are adapted to the S-phonological and morphological structure. Thus, Acosta-Belàn (1975: 153-154) found that recently arrived Puerto Ricans began to borrow a large number of lexical items from English for new functions, experiences and objects not found in the traditional setting (la factorià, "the factory," la grocerià "the grocery store," el rufó "the roof "). Karttunen (1977: 178) reported similar borrowings for Finnish migrants in the U.S. (e.g. fortsulai "Fourth of July", Halouini "Halloween", tenskivi "Thanksgiving").

Often the borrowing is the result of the coinage of a D-term even when an equivalent one exists in the S-language. These words in Finnish: talo "house", huone "room", järvi "lake", mäki "hill", juosta "to run", and keskustella "to talk" became hanssi, ruuma, leeki, hilli, runnata and tookentaa in the Finnish of recently arrived Finns in the U.S. (Karttunen, 1977:178). Sometimes word-borrowing involves a restriction of the term's original meaning. For example in standard Norwegian [laere] means both "to learn" and "to teach." In North America it continues to mean "to learn" while the non-adapted form teach (retaining the D-phonology) means "to teach formally" (Haugen, 1972: 19). Further, veg in standard Norwegian means any kind of road or path as well as the more abstract "in the way of." In American-Norwegian veg has retained the abstract meaning but has restricted its concrete reference to cowpaths and minor roads; while important roads and highways are referred to as roads (Haugen, 1972: 20). There are many instances in Canadian Latvian of the same process(c.f. Rodman & Deglavs-Brenzinger, 1973).

Grabowski (1975:62) claims that grammatical interference occurs more often than is commonly believed. He (ibid.: 64-66) was able to identify several English grammatical structures in the Polish of Toronto's immigrants. These immigrants used Polish grammatical categories as if they were English: possessive pronouns were used as they would be in English; the nominative was used for all six Polish cases; and the verb structure is like that of English,not standard Polish (ibid: 64). The identification of Polish grammatical functions with English ones caused a simplification of Polish grammar because distinctions which would be obligatory in standard Polish but not in English were obliterated. This same process has been found in English-Canada for Czech (Bubenik, 1978); Latvian (Rodman & Deglavs-Brenzinger, 1973); Dutch (Gossens, 1973), and Finnish in the U.S. (Karttunen, 1977).

There is some evidence that many im/migrants do not speak a standard variety of their mother tongue before migrating (c.f. Bubenik, 1978: 10-11; Canale & Mougeon, 1978: 97; and Karttunen, 1977: 183). Thus, if they spoke a rural or urban lower-class variety which has a natural tendency toward rule generalization resulting in morphophonological and/or syntactic simplification (c.f. Brent-Palmer, 1978: Ch. 7), the impact of the D-language

may only speed up the process of simplification (c.f. Bubenik, 1978:10-11); Canale & Mougeon, 1978: 97 ; Karttunen, 1977: 183).

A sociolinguistic interpretation of contact-dialect. From a sociolinguistic viewpoint, the above process creates two types of linguistic variability:

(1) Individual variability: An increase in individual variability occurs because the same person can alternate between two variants of the same form as does the Polish-Canadian who uses both grocery and groseriana in the same sentence (c.f. Grabowski, 1975:62).

(2) Intralanguage variability: Variability within the S-language is created because of the massive borrowing. The changes at the phonological, morphological, syntactic, and lexical levels result in an L different enough from the standard L to warrant consideration as a unique variety -- a contact-dialect (Haugen, 1977). For all practical purposes contact-dialects are often incomprehensible to standard speakers of the language (ibid.)

Contact-dialects have several sociological characteristics:

(1) They increase the social isolation of S-groups, because they maintain a social distance between speakers of standard and contact varieties of the migrant-L. In some cases they also reinforce ethnic boundaries between S- and D- ethnic groups because those D-group members who do learn the S-ethnic group's language almost always learn the standard variety. (e.g. Anglo-Ontarians tend to learn standard French,not Franco-Ontarian).See Brent (1974) for a discussion;

(2) They are a framework for in-group identity and are learned as the mother tongue of S-migrant populations. Most of these mother tongue speakers of contact varieties are unfamiliar with the standard variety, and thus, are often not aware of the difference between their L-code and that of the standard variety (Acosta-Belàn, 1975: 155).

(3) They are almost never written (Haugen, 1977).

Contact-dialects of S-populations which are usually non-standard varieties are almost always stigmatized. There is a tendency to see these mixed dialects as a chaotic confusion of two L's (Haugen, 1972: 127) and to believe that their speakers do not know the mother tongue very well (c.f. Canale & Mougeon 1978: 93). However, a sociolinguistic analysis demonstrates that contact-dialects are linguistically systematic, and like all languages, have norms for correct and incorrect code usage (Haugen, 1977, Canale & Mougeon 1978: 97).

Several migrant contact-dialects have been described for im/migrant groups in North America: Finnish (Karttunen, 1977), Danish, Norwegian, Swedish (Haugen, 1972),and Spanish-American 'Spanglish' (Valencia, 1975)

in the U.S., as well as Czech (Bubenik, 1978, 1978), German (Urion, 1971), Greek (Orlanski, 1971), Latvian (Rodman & Deglavs-Brenzinger 1973), and Polish, Russian and Ukrainian (Grabowski, 1975) in Canada. Given the universality of the formation of migrant contact-dialects, and evidence that Finnish has changed in contact with other L's: Finnish-American, Finnish-Swedish, and Russian-Finnish (Karttunen, 1977: 183), I am of the opinion that the 'confused L' of Finnish migrant children in Sweden reported by T. & S.-K. could be a contact-dialect which has been judged by the idealized norms of standard Finnish. A sociolinguistic investigation of the children's language would of course be needed to substantiate this claim.

Norms of communication and speech communities. Because of the diversity of the uses to which language may be put during communication, ethnolinguists define a speech community as a group that shares:

> a set of rules for the use and interpretation of verbal communication (Hymes, 1972: 34).

A lack of shared rules of communication between people from different speech communities leads to mis-communication. Even people of the same mother tongue who share the knowledge of a set of formal linguistic features, may nevertheless misunderstand one another, because they are from different speech communities and have different usage rules for interpreting one another's messages correctly. (Gumperz & Hernandez-Chavez, 1972: 100). For example, all English speakers could find the sentence "Your mama's a peanut man" intelligible; however only those who are familiar with its use as a ritualized insult within the American-Black adolescent ghetto culture will be able to interpret the social meaning. People who speak different languages may also belong to different speech communities. Ervin-Tripp (1977) claims that directives (e.g. imperatives) are reacted to differently by Turkish, Italian, Norwegian, Hungarian and American children.

Aspects of performance style: differential contextualization and literacy. There are several factors which make up a group's rules of L-use and distinguish between speech communities.[12] Only some with pedagogical importance are discussed below.

Communities differ in the degree to which information is encoded linguistically, made explicit, and transmitted as part of the speech event[13] during communication. According to Mitchell-Kernan (1972: 328-29), in contextualized speech, meaning which is often assumed by linguists to be entirely signalled through code features may be dependent in varying degrees upon several non-linguistic components of the speech event:

(a) shared personal and cultural knowledge;

(b) information from the immediate environment;

(c) codified kinetic messages: voice modulation, body rhythm, stance, gesture and eye-behaviour, etc.

Contextualized meaning is important in this type of speech event even when the speaker uses verbally manipulated forms of speech.[14] (c.f. Mitchell-Kernan, 1972: 317). In some speech communities these types of uses are socially codified during a variety of speech events to such an extent that the overall verbal performance style becomes contextualized.[15] See Gans, 1962, Hall, 1977: 91-100, and Mitchell-Kernan, 1972 for examples of these types of communities.

During decontextualized speech events, especially in the written mode, the meaning of the message is concentrated in the linguistic code itself.[16] Decontextualized language is often accompanied by a restriction of kinetic output and is most frequently carried out by people who have little or no shared experience. Some speech communities seem to prefer a decontextualized performance style (c.f. Hall, 1977: 91, Kochman, 1972: 237-238).

Preferences for one over the other degree of contextualization should differentiate between speech communities in a radical way. Varying degrees of contextualization in a speech community seem to be related to the level of technology, the degree of shared social experience, the frequency of face-to-face communication, the frequency of communication in formal contexts and the degree of literacy (Hall, 1977: 90-93; Kay, 1977). Of these, the degree of literacy may exert the most influence on contextualization. Based on the scant ethnographic information discussed above, one could tentatively postulate that decontextualized language is associated with literate speech communities, and more formal domains of the society, especially the school. See Cummins (1979), Hall (1977), Kochman (1972) and Olson (1977) for a discussion of this point.

There is some ethnographic evidence that in speech communities where a high value is placed on the written channel, those who master a decontextualized speech style receive high prestige. (c.f. Eakins & Eakins, 1978; Kochman, 1972.)

One could also posit a relationship between high contextualization and oral traditions. Consequently speech communities with a rich oral tradition should tend toward a frequent use of highly contextualized speech events. There is considerable ethnographic evidence that in communities with an emphasis on contextualized speech, prestige is accorded the individuals with expertise in oral communication. (c.f. Abrahams, 1972; Allegne, 1977; Kochman, 1972; Spindler, 1974a). The man-of-words: preacher , story-teller , teller of folk tales, jokes etc., conveys his intent through the subtle manipulation of non-linguistic devices (ibid.) In some of these communities, if a speech is read out without an accompanying kinetic message, the reader is considered stupid and emotionally shallow (Kochman, 1972; Ward, 1971).[17]

A telling ethnographic description of this type of contextualized speech community with a rich oral tradition is offered by Ward (1971) who was concerned with lower class rural children in Rosepoint, Florida.

> The Rosepoint home relies on verbal rather than on the written word as a medium. Adults do not read to children nor encourage writing. Extra-verbal communication such as body movement or verbal communication such as story-telling or gossip are preferred to the written page. For children of a culture rich in in-group lore and oral traditions, the written word is a pallid substitute *[. . .]* The Rosepoint child is rewarded for linguistic creativity *[. . .]* In the classroom such language has an entirely different interpretation placed on it. (Ward 1971: 91-92).

In general, speech communities which value literate culture tend to be found in 'Gesellschaft-like' societies[18] -- especially European and Euro-American ones among the middle and upper classes (Eakins & Eakins, 1978, Kochman, 1972). Speech communities with a highly contextualized performance style and a rich oral tradition are generally found in 'Gemeinschaft-like' social units limited to face-to-face interaction (c.f. Kay 1977). Consequently in literate multilingual societies preferences for the written channel may divide along class and ethnic lines such that lower-class urban S-groups may have a rich oral tradition, devalue highly decontextualized language and/or have little contact with the literate culture; while D-groups place high value on decontextualized language and the written channel and place little or no value on the oral channel or actively devalue it. Thus the change from an oral tradition in the home to the literate school tradition may involve a special case of acculturation for the S-child. The potential for interethnic misunderstanding on this issue is obvious.

Aspects of performance style and the differential functional load placed on language. Ethnographic evidence from around the world suggests that speech communities differ in the number and relative importance assigned to the following functions: to inform (referential); to learn and solve problems (heuristic); to express emotions (expressive); to persuade people to do something (manipulative); to demonstrate social identity and status (integrative); to discipline social behaviour (social control); and to develop the L for its own sake (the aesthetic function). See Halliday (1973) for a more in-depth discussion.

For example, in an ethnolinguistic study of a Caribbean speech community Kernan et al. (1978) found that even for native speakers of Belizian City Creole who had mastered standard English, speech that was primarily referential and lacking in skill in the use of the aesthetic-emotive function of L accorded little prestige or social success to the speakers. For groups that value an expressive and aesthetic use of L which arouses feelings and shows spontaneous flair in coining new expressions, emphasis is placed on the way something is said rather than on the content. Emphasis on the aesthetic-expressive functions seems characteristic of Black ghetto Americans

(Kochman, 1972); Turks (Farb, 1974: 109-111); some southeast Asians (Hasan, 1976); and many lower class European children in urban centres (Edwards, 1976: 117-118). In contrast, the upper classes of highly technological, literate societies seem to place the heaviest functional load on the referential, heuristic, integrative and social control functions, and to devalue or be uninterested in the expressive, aesthetic ones in most formal domains. (Hall, 1977: 92-100; Kochman, 1972; Brent-Palmer, 1977). In these speech communities the breadth of verbal repertoire and verbal artistry -- the aesthetic function -- is consigned to specialists. It is not considered to be a necessary aspect of the communicative competence of ordinary or even educated members of the community.

There is an interaction between the degree of contextualization and the distribution of the functional load placed on L. In the urban centres of literate, technologically advanced societies, this results in a speech community which communicates most cultural skills via the referential L function and in which almost all cultural knowledge is spelled out in a highly elaborated language that is frequently encoded in book form.

Thus, for the upper classes of these societies (e.g. in German, Swiss German, Scandinavian, and to some extent Anglo-North American societies (c.f. Hall, 1977; Kay, 1977; Kochman, 1972), teaching via language (i.e. the heuristic L-function) is the valued mode of teaching/learning for both the formal and informal acquisition of cultural skills, and children receive instruction verbally at a very early age (Farb, 1974; Lewis and Cherry, 1977).

A quite different pattern emerges for less technologically advanced non-urbanized societies as well as for the lower classes of urbanized societies. An ethnographic comparison of Indo-Pakistani (Hasan, 1976); West Indian (Allegne, 1976, 1977); Amerindian (John, 1973); Phillips, 1970); and lower class urban children (Bernstein, 1973; Edwards, 1976; Kochman, 1972; Robinson, 1971: 85-86) reveals that in the home context, learning takes place primarily through several non-verbal processes. Both technical learning, cooking, driving cars, building etc., and social skills (i.e. the maintenance of interpersonal relations in the socially approved manner) seem to be learned through observation, supervised participation and self-initiated repetition (c.f. Allegne, 1976; Hasan, 1976; John, 1973; Phillips, 1970).

In contrast to the upper classes, adults in these Gemeinschaft-like communities do not seem to be prone to indulging in informal 'testing sessions' during which they ask specific skill-related questions, and in which children demonstrate their knowledge of the skill by responding in a verbally elaborate way. Success is simply adjudged while the skill is being performed (c.f. Allegne, 1976, 1977; Bernstein, 1973; Dumont, 1972; Hasan, 1976; Kochman 1972; Phillips, 1970). This difference has important pedagogical implications.

Given the above, in interethnic contact situations one should expect S-groups to emphasize one set of functions and degree of verbal elaboration while D-groups prefer another.

Aspects of performance style: Differential discourse and cognitive styles. Kochman (1972: 246) describes a study comparing the discourse style of Black-American inner-city youths with that of Anglo-American middle class youths. The Black youths had an inductive approach to discourse: they made a series of concrete statements from which fundamental assumptions had to be inferred. The Anglo-American youths, on the other hand, evidenced a deductive approach: they made explicit statements about their propositions and inferred probable behaviour in terms of the propositions. These two styles seem to parallel the relational and analytical cognitive styles described by Cohen (1973: 497) for lower and upper class children. The lower class children preferred the relational style (comparable to the inductive one as described by Kochman, 1972: 246) while the upper class children used the analytical (comparable to Kochman's deductive). Others have noted a similar difference between ethnic groups: lower class Irish and Scots in Britain (c.f. McKinnon, 1977), West Indians (Allegne, 1977) and East Indo-Pakistani (Hasan, 1976) seem to prefer the inductive style, while middle class Anglo-Americans (Cohen, 1973; Eakins & Eakins, 1978); Germans and Scandinavians (Hall, 1977: 90) value the deductive style.

These differences in discourse and cognitive style may have important implications for the S-child's school performance because they could cause a conflict between S-performance norms and those of the school which are controlled by upper-class D-groups.

Aspects of performance style: Differential structures of conversation. Speech communities differ as to who (according to age, sex, social role, status, etc.) can participate in verbal interaction (Hymes, 1972). Children interact with others in two basic patterns: the horizontal (child-to-child) and the vertical (child-to-adult). The emphasis during socialization on one or the other results in very different patterns of interaction with adult authority figures (Hasan, 1976).

In many non-technological, Gemeinschaft-like communities, as well as in urban lower class speech communities, the horizontal peer-to-peer interaction pattern seems to be the most frequent one available to the child during socialization. For example, Phillips (1972: 384-386) reports that although the Warm Spring Amerindian children are accustomed to interacting with a great number of children and adults, their most frequent interaction is between peers. This seems to be a widespread pattern among S-groups; it has been reported for ghetto Blacks in the U.S. (Labov 1972); and lower class immigrants in the U.S. See also Gans (1962) for Italians, Baker (1972) for Spanish Americans, and Hasan (1976) for some South-east Asians.

In contrast to this pattern, many middle and upper class speech communities, living in highly technological and urbanized societies seem to prefer the adult-child vertical pattern almost to the exclusion of the horizontal one. There are reports that middle-class parents spend much more time interacting verbally with their young children and supervising their activities at an earlier age than do lower class parents (Lewis & Cherry, 1977). This adult-child pattern continues into young adulthood except for a brief period during the middle teen years (Labov, 1972a,b). Even during this period, the vertical pattern is more frequent for the upper classes than it is for the lower ones (Kochman, 1972: 243).

Since the school pattern is vertical -- adult-to-child/children, many researchers have suggested that an awareness of the 'peer centredness' of children with a horizontal pattern is necessary for an understanding of the S-child's participation in classroom dialogues and on tests. (Phillips, 1972; Dumont, 1972; Kochman, 1972; Robinson, 1971).

The persistence of the traditional performance style. There is evidence which suggests that a speech community's performance style functions independently from the linguistic code. For example, there are numerous examples of S-groups who speak the D-group's language as a mother tongue but appear to use that L in unique ways (e.g. West/East Indians, the Scots, Irish, and Welsh speaking British English; or Black, Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, Italian, and Jewish communities using American English. Thus Toelkan (1971) discovered that although Amerindian students enrolled at the University of Oregon typically spoke the D-language, English, as their mother tongue, their performance style reflected patterns of the traditional Amerindian culture.

Kaplan (1966) found the same phenomenon in the written work of native-like speakers of English as an L2.

Given the way in which speech communities inculcate these traditional communicative norms during socialization it seems reasonable to conclude that in a multi-ethnic contact situation, children from Gemeinschaft-like groups enter school with a unique performance style which is radically different from the communicative style expected in the classroom even though they may apear to control the linguistic code.[19]

The persistence of a traditional S-group speech style can be in part explained by D-group's behaviour. The legitimizing behaviour exercized by D-groups in restricting the S-culture to the home domain reinforces the differences in performance style between S- and D- groups.

The performance style typical of Gemeinschaft-like groups is reinforced in those S-groups who over a long period of time are locked into a social contact pattern that does not permit them access to formal domains (c.f. Kay, 1977). The extent to which this situation develops into a case of normative conflict depends on the psycho-social climate existing between S- and D-groups.

The general pattern of S-performance style suggests that the Finnish migrant children described by T. & S.-K. are from a Gemeinschaft-like speech community, differing from both middle class Finns and middle class Swedes. If so, their developmental retardation in school and on tests may be the result of the discontinuity between the home and school communicative norms.

Inter-ethnic conflict and S-group accommodation. We know very little about the actual L-behavioural correlates of interethnic conflict. Most educational research into school achievement and cognitive development, for example, is carried out on the assumption that communication is symmetrical: i.e. that it takes place between equals in status and power. Thus, even though T. & S.-K. (1976:40) claimed that the silent Finnish S-culture in Sweden is a reflection of the type of power relations

holding between Swedes and Finnish migrants, they did not attempt to account for the S-students' low academic performance in terms of social-psychological factors.

The ethno- and sociolinguists cited in preceding sections have also assumed that communication between ethnic groups is symmetric in terms of power, and that any differences observed(e.g. that the members of one group are consistently passive or 'silent' during communication) are only due to differences in the degree of shared cultural and linguistic background. However, within the framework of conflict theory, this is not the only explanation.

Kochman et al. (1972: xii) claim that power relations in communicative contexts are expressed through patterns of accommodation by S-groups who, knowing the risk involved, avoid asserting their cultural norms in contexts governed by D-groups.

Some linguistic techniques for managing stigma. Because negatively evaluated groups have a syndrome of behaviours that serve as a sign of their stigmatization, they develop a number of strategies to manage the perception of their identity during interaction with others. (Goffman, 1963: 43, 92). For educational purposes the following strategies seem to be pedagogically interesting: concealment; concealment and in-and-out-group membership.

Concealment. The concealment of the behaviours that carry stigma is one of the most common strategies employed by stigmatized individuals (c.f. Goffman, 1963: 92). During verbal interaction between S- and D-group members, the refusal to talk -- the silence -- of the S-stigmatized member may serve the purpose of concealing stigmatized L-behaviours such as the use of a S-language or the incomplete mastery of the D-language. The use of this strategy could explain the remarkable silence noted for immigrant children in Sweden (Stockfelt-Hoaton, 1975:125); and lower class immigrant adults in Toronto (Breton, 1977).

Concealment and in- and out-group membership. The division of the social world into a large out-group of those from whom the behaviour stigma is hidden and a small in-group among whose members the stigma is revealed, is a widely employed strategy of concealment used by discredited individuals. (Goffman, 1963:95).

For purposes of the present paper one of the most interesting L-related examples was reported by Eidheim (1969) who studied the pattern of interaction between Lapps and Norwegians in Northern Norway. He found that Norwegians -- the D-group -- defined all standards in public institutions, and that Lappish behaviour was not an alternative in formal domains. In these spheres there was no institutionalized interaction in which a Lapp behaving like a Lapp had an accepted role.

The local Norwegians regarded Lappish as an inferior language and considered it improper and challenging if used in their presence. (ibid:49). Further, a Lappish accent in Norwegian was also stigmatized and the university-educated, more assimilated Lapps spoke non-accented standard Norwegian.

In response to this socio-political climate, Lappish behaviour was not acted out in the presence of those viewed as out-group individuals:

that is, educated Lapps, Norwegians, and strangers -- including those members of the three groups who spoke Lappish. Outside the home, the local Lapps treated Lappish as if it were a secret language. When local Lapps were together in public, they separated themselves into small closed groups and spoke Lappish in low voices. In these ways, Lappish behaviours were strictly reserved for use only when Lappish in-group identities were involved (Eidheim 1969).

Stigma and restricted performance. Members of socially marked and highly stigmatized groups seem to employ strategies for handling behaviour stigma along both class and ethnic boundaries. Thus, lower class S-groups (e.g. lower class Lapps) seem to place middle class more educated members of their own ethnic group (i.e. middle class Lapps) in the D-group category (i.e. with Norwegians) interacting with them in the same subordinate-dominant pattern of asymmetrical communication that they engage in with members of the D-ethnic group.

The management of L-stigma not only creates in- and out- group boundaries but also has a direct impact on performance style. It seems evident from the above that in most cases the concealment strategies would radically restrict the choice of available performance styles that the S-ethnic group can employ in asymmetrical communication. Certainly the silence or passive acquiescing behaviour in interethnic and interclass communication has important implications for S-students' behaviour in the classroom and on tests.

4. ACCOUNTING FOR CONTRASTIVE LANGUAGE NORMS IN THE SCHOOL AND ON TESTS

Subordinate home-school language switch. By this point in the analysis it should be evident that the S-child brings a unique set of linguistic behaviours to the classroom. Since language is the medium of instruction for most curriculum content, the relationship between the linguistic code and performance style learned at home and the sociolinguistic norms of the school is critical. Children are differentially prepared by their home experience to cope with the linguistic interaction requirements of schools and tests. The styles of L learned may inhibit the child's participation in the learning environment, or the school may repress rather than maximize the child's skills (c.f. Cazden, 1973).

S-children functioning under the double burden of L-culture conflict and social stigmatization may be expected to have the greatest difficulty in coping with the home-school language switch. This section attempts to account for the S-student's performance in school in terms of this thesis.

A short ethnographic profile of communication in the school. An ethnographic profile of the classroom might characterize communication as follows:

(1) Almost all non-verbal extralinguistic factors are excluded from the communication. Even in the early grades there is a tendency for meaning to be communicated exclusively through the manipulation

of linguistic devices and this decontextualization of performance style increases with advancing grade level. (Alleyne, 1976, 1977; Brent-Palmer, 1977; Cazden, 1973a; Kochman, 1972; McDermott, 1974);

(2) The written L is the preferred medium of communication and is accorded, even in early school years, higher status than the spoken L. Students are graded in the early years primarily on how fast and well they learn to read. (See Alleyne, 1977; Kochman, 1972: 238; McDermott, 1974).

(3) The referential use of L to communicate precise, detailed information is preferred to all other uses of L except the heuristic (Alleyne, 1977; Brent-Palmer, 1977; Hymes, 1970);

(4) Learning is achieved primarily via language, and the idealized norms of the standard variety of the D-ethnic group is often the only acceptable norm (c.f. Alleyne, 1976, 1977; Brent-Palmer, 1977; Kochman, 1972; Labov, 1972 a,b.)

(5) All written texts are in the standard variety and contain vocabulary which would be foreign to the speakers of a contact-variety (c.f. Cazden, 1975; Haugen, 1972; Valencia, 1977);[20]

(6) The discourse style employed by teachers and expected of pupils -- especially older ones -- reflects the preference for the written L: (a) sentences are long and grammatically complex; (b) the topics covered are those requiring extensive planning, exposition, and vocabulary acquisition (Kochman, 1972 for (a), (b)); topics are developed in a deductive (c.f. Cazden, 1972; Erickson, 1969; Kochman, 1972) and analytical manner (c.f. Cohen, 1973). The discourse style is elaborated;

(7) The total classroom organization supports the decontextualized, elaborated, analytical style: the emphasis is on concentration, independent work; attention to detail, precise time-schedules, and an impersonal approach to experience (Cohen, 1973).

(8) Teachers elicit information from students during frequent question-and-answer periods. They ask questions to which they already know the answers: that is, convergent questions (Regan 1977:402). Children are expected to be answer-oriented and competent in demonstrating their knowledge in a verbally elaborate way. Students' responses should convey precise information and facts developed linearly one at a time (c.f. Kaplan, 1966: 74) so that they give evidence of 'clear and logical thinking' (see Alleyne, 1977; Brent-Palmer, 1977).

Language discontinuity in the school. Kochman (1972:244) claims that successful communication in the classroom is predicated on L-socialization in the middle class culture. Indeed the middle class pattern with its emphasis on decontextualized L adult-to-child socialization via L; familiarity with the standard-L; preference for the written-L; and emphasis on deductive and analytical style does seem to be a mirror-image of the school pattern.

The above ethnographc profile of the school and the earlier descriptions of S-performance style strongly suggest that S-students will have great difficulty transferring their pattern to the school, and that most of them will experience extreme cultural dislocation in the school context. For them schooling involves massive acculturation to a 'foreign' L-culture. Given this situation, they cannot be expected to attain the type of abstract conceptualization necessary for optimal school success.

The discontinuity becomes an impassable gulf when one considers that the S-language culture is usually stigmatized in the school[21] as it is in the larger society. Moreover, the strategies S-children employ to cope with their stigma status can radically limit their flexibility in interacting with teachers as well as with the course content.

Testing S-children and code discontinuity. This investigation of potential sociolinguistic antecedents of minority school failure has now reached the point where it is possible to tentatively explore a different thesis from that of T. & S.-K. with respect to Finnish migrant children in Sweden. Namely, that there is a sociolinguistic mismatch between the migrant Finnish L-culture and the standardized test instruments used in the schools. And it is this mismatch that produces evidence of low L-skills which, in turn, give the 'illusion' of a lack of competence in the mother tongue. This thesis is investigated in detail below.

The data base underlying the semilingual notion consisted of the performance of migrant Finnish children in the Finnish-L version of the Brever-Weuffen Reading Readiness Test (the R-R Test) and a standardized Finnish-L version of the Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities -- the ITPA (T. & S.-K., 1977: 40-47). In general, these children in Sweden performed poorly on the R-R Test; and they were 1.5 - 2 years behind matched Finnish children from Finland on three subtests of the ITPA T. & S.-K. 1977: 56-57).

Cicourel (1974:215) claims that conventional testing theory conceives of the interaction between tester/teacher and child in terms of strictly uniform, isolated pairs of questions and answers which do not probe the culturally different child's background knowledge. Since most items on standardized tests are based on a middle class, written variety of the standard-L (Edwards, 1976: 84), it should be expected that speakers of contact varieties will experience problems in relating effectively to the items' form and content (Wolfram, 1976).

Articulatory testing and S-code simplication. There are three main types of test-items requiring a response in the standard-L which affect

the performance of non-standard speakers: phonological; syntactic; and lexico-semantic. Each of these is explored below and related to specific aspects of S-code and performance style variability.

Tests such as the kinesthetic sub-test of the R-R Test only score the 'correctly' imitated pronounciation of words containing what are considered to be difficult articulatory features (c.f. T. & S.-K. 1977:41). Such tests pose problems for testees who do not have these features in their linguistic repertoire because of the general tendency toward linguistic simplification in the direction of the D-language attested to in contact-varieties. See above for a discussion of this point. Similar problems exist for language-based tests of auditory discrimination -- such as the phonemic sub-test of the R-R Test (c.f. T. & S.-K., 1977:41) -- which makes use of minimal word pairs (Wolfram, 1976:280).

Wolfram (1976: 280) claims that articulation testing is one of the areas in which dialect bias is the most apparent[22] because of two types of sociolinguistic phenomena:

(1) In formal contexts, under the pressure of communicating with standard speakers (i.e. the tester) S-speechers shift in a non-systematic way toward the standard (Canale & Mougeon 1977; Craig, 1966; Labov, 1972 b). Such a shift is reflected in the linguistically erratic nature of the S-students' responses on items where the standard answer is the only correct one (Craig, 1971).

(2) Speakers of non-standard and/or contact-varieties tend to pronounce items in imitation tasks according to the phonological rules of their own variety (Labov, 1972 a).

Children whose L-production on tests is influenced by (1) and (2) above score like the migrant Finnish children (T. & S.-K., 1977:56) well below the average for their age level. Some educational researchers have misinterpreted this 'poor' performance as evidence of 'retarded articulatory development' instead of an indication of the test's sociolinguistic bias. Parker (1978: 54, ftn. 9) claims that the conclusions drawn from the T. & S.-K. (1976, 1977) research ignored the whole issue of the difference between the L1 variety spoken in the migrant community and the formal Finnish found on standardized tests.

Verbal analogies and vocabulary change. It was pointed out earlier that the S-language's lexical system in a contact situation is most sensitive to massive change under the impact of the D-language. Often this borrowing involves the semantic displacement of a standard lexical item so that the original phonetic shape of the word remains while all or part of the semantic content changes in the direction of the D-language.

Tests which require the production of verbal analogies or vocabulary tests in the standard variety of the subordinate L do not tap these "new" lexical items and meanings, and the testee may not know the standard meaning of the test items. (Wolfram, 1976:283). For example, if it appeared

on an analogy test, would the speaker of English-Norwegian know the standard Norwegian meaning of veg which has been restricted and displaced in the contact-variety? Unless analogy tests control for this type of bias, speakers of contact-varieties can be expected to perform poorly. Unfortunately such control has not been exercised, and educational researchers like T. & S.-K. (1977: 57) have ignored the likelihood of test bias in interpreting the results, and have concluded that the S-testees lack the breadth of vocabulary development required for reading readiness. (ibid.)

Testing concept attainment: the problem of performance style and asymmetric communication. Performance on tests is highly sensitive to the discontinuity between the testee's habitual performance style and that required on the test. Although all aspects of the mismatch mentioned above have an impact on the S-child's performance, in my opinion the difference between the S-discourse/cognitive style and that tapped by the test is the most problematic one for the S-testee.

For example, Finnish migrant pupils performed very poorly on the Verbal Expression sub-test of the ITPA (T. & S.-K. 1977: 56-57) which required them to tell as much as they could about four familiar objects: a ball, a toy cube, an envelope, and a button (ibid.:44). The objects were presented one at a time, and the testee was asked to tell the tester about them. The responses were scored for the number of 'concepts' expressed. Concepts were defined as: the name, colour, shape, usage, size, and other classifying qualities of the object. The goal of the exercise was to:

> Measure the child's ability to express concepts and utilize speech. (T. & S.-K. 1977: 56-57. Emphasis added).

Educational researchers interpret the results of this type of test as an indication of concept attainment and/or cognitive development (Cohen, 1977; Wolfram 1977). But is it?

Describing a picture or an object is not a straightforward matter. First of all, the object may not be familiar to the testee. How many lower-class children have access to toy cubes? Further, responses to the request "describe this object" are not universal across speech communities. A high score on the question presupposes the universality of an emphasis on the referential, informative, analytic, and non-personal use of L. A description of the shape, size, use, etc. is not predicated on the personal meaning of the object to the testee nor the expressive use of language.

To highlight the importance of this point, consider the following hypothetical example: A lower class child who habitually expresses himself in a contextualized, expressive language, and an inductive, relational discourse style is requested to describe the commonality between the pictures of a policeman, a doctor, a farmer, and a sailor. He might respond in the following way:

> *[. . .]* he might say they go together because the doctor helps the other men and gives medicine to them, or *[. . .]* they go together because they like each other *[. . .]* (Regan, 1971: 108).

The child fails the question, because he does not demonstrate adequate

concept attainment. By way of contrast:

> The middle class first-grader tends to pass the test with flying colours: he comes up with a good, acceptable concept or category by saying that they are all "men" or they are all "people" (ibid.)

The middle class child shared the same orientation to language as that required on the test; the lower class child had other meanings attached to the request to "describe the commonality of the pictures." The middle class child could demonstrate 'concept attainment' by responding in the habitual performance mode. By contrast, in order to achieve the same results, the lower class child would have to be aware of the difference between the habitual mode of performance learned at home and how to execute the style required on the test.

The S-child's task is further complicated by the fact that the S-language and performance style is usually stigmatized. The frequency of a silent, 'silly', or one-word response from children who are often from cultures rich in oral or bardic tradition -- such as Scots Gaelic children (c.f. MacKinnon, 1977:176) attests to the necessity for the child to develop strategies to cope with the situation. In view of the cognitive complexity of the task and the socio-psychological stress placed on S-children, it should come as no surprise that most of them fail under the burden of such a complicated situation. What is surprising is that so many investigators fail to take account of the complexity of the situation, and by dubbing the child 'retarded' in concept formation and/or 'semilingual' consistently 'blame the victim' (c.f. Ryan, 1971).

5. AN EVALUATION OF THE SEMILINGUAL NOTION AND LANGUAGE SHELTER PROGRAMS WITHIN A SOCIOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

An evaluation of the semilingual notion within a sociological framework. Within the sociological framework elaborated in this paper, there is no need to posit an intervening variable such as 'levels of competence' in order to explain the lack of school success in subjects predicated on the mastery of a high degree of 'cognitive' and 'linguistic' skills at an 'abstract' level.

The expression "a high degree of . . . " is the operative term. In a conflict socio-cultural framework, groups are seen as unequal in power and in the control of their lives, but merely different in language and culture. Thus failure to adapt to the L-behaviour required in school is a result of an interaction of a very low level of power and a high degree of L-cultural difference. The S-child has a 'restricted code' only as a manifestation of trying to cope with stigma plus cultural difference in a hostile environment -- the school. Outside that context the S-child may belong to a rich, contextualized oral culture, have an interesting discourse style and be highly independent and creative. L-education that ignores this potential richness is not starting with the student's actual L-culture any more than that which openly claims assimilationist goals and educates the child in her/his second L.

In terms of the semilingual and threshold notions, the expression a 'high degree of linguistic or cognitive skill' takes on quite a different meaning. Instead of viewing standardized tests as a type of social activity which should be submitted to a contrastive socio/ethnolinguistic analysis, and the results of such tests as evidence of conflicting interethnic norms, T. & S.-K. automatically equated a 'high score' in terms of the test's norms with high L-competence and developed cognitive functioning, while a low score was equated with semilingualism. S-language norms and behaviour are not considered different from, and therefore in conflict with, D-norms; they are simply a less competent version of D-norms. Even within the home domain, which is where in-group identity is played out by S-groups (Fishman, 1976, 1977) the D-norm was still the only yardstick of behaviour.

This 'more-or-less' approach to linguistic competence in multilingual societies clearly places the notion of semilingualism in its present formulation outside the conflict approach adopted here; nor would it fit into a sociolinguistic orientation which emphasizes variability, relativity and interlinguistic difference.

An evaluation of the Language Shelter Program within a sociological framework. In view of the preceding sections, the notion of migrant semilingualism does not seem well enough founded to justify the unique format proposed in the L-Shelter Program. If the concept itself is in doubt we may well inquire whether there is any need for im/migrant children to spend years correcting their 'deficient' mother tongue?

In fact there is evidence that the introduction of instruction in a standard variety of the mother tongue may pose even more problems than education via the D-language (c.f. Baratz & Baratz, 1975; and Fishman, 1977). At the least it could increase an awareness of the stigmatization of the contact-dialect within the mother-tongue community (Valencia, 1975), at worst it would annihilate the mother tongue culture and identity altogether, without however succeeding in replacing them by the standard variety of the mother-tongue culture (c.f. Baratz & Baratz, 1975: 476). Further, S-children who do not have contact with standard speaking models or access to formal instruction in the majority-L tend to develop non-standard varieties of that language (c.f. Brent-Palmer 1978: Ch. 5). Given the time spent with little formal instruction in the majority-L, it is highly probable that S-children in a L-shelter type program would develop a non-standard variety of the majority-L that is socially marked (ibid.).

Such outcomes would not be in harmony with the goals of the Language Shelter Program which are to develop a type of functional bilingualism that enables the child to identify with and participate in the origin and receiving societies on an equal basis with natives (T. & S.-K 1977:33-34). Consequently, because of the doubtful nature of the Swedish research on semilingualism, policy makers and educators should be extremely cautious about considering the Language Shelter Program as a model for the establishment of vernacular education programs for immigrant children.

Social and pedagogical implications of a non-standard variety as a medium of instruction. If education in the standard variety of the S-language is problematic and these populations are to receive education

in the mother tongue -- then in which variety? For how long? And, finally, who is going to decide?

The recognition of the contact variety as part of the S-child's native communicative competence, and the desire to include it in the classroom as a medium of instruction raises several problems. First of all, it can be predicted within the framework of the expanded sociological model that educators will show a high resistence to the inclusion of the socially stigmatized L-culture of S-groups in the classroom. Since S-groups do not usually have any control over test construction -- the major indicator of academic success --, it is unlikely that the well established norms on standardized tests will change enough to significantly reduce the L-culture gap for the S-child.

There may be more serious objections to the inclusion of an S-vehicle of communication in the school. Parental support, for example, seems to be a necessary condition for the successful outcome of education in the vernacular (c.f. Fishman, 1976). Given the other expressions of interclass L-differences, members of S-ethnolinguistic groups should not be homogeneous in their support for the mother tongue as a medium of instruction. Indeed, Brent-Palmer (1979) found some evidence that im/migrant communities may be divided along class lines in their tolerance for the vernacular in education, with the lower-classes supporting it for transitional purposes only, preferring education in the majority language for their children. Middle-class parents on the other hand, who are already fluent in the majority-L, may wish to have their children educated in the vernacular for as long as possible. (ibid.) See Mougeon (1978) for an example of social class differences in parental support for the use of their own S-language, French, as a vehicle of instruction in Franco-Ontarian schools.

In terms of the framework of the expanded sociological model it can be predicted that some S-adult members of a speech community may preserve the S-variety of the L for in-group identity only. And many lower-class S-parents, and some middle class ones, may not tolerate the stigmatized, non-standard varieties of the vernacular as a medium of instruction (c.f. Fishman, 1977).

Thus, the potential objection of some D-group and S-group members to any inclusion of the stigmatized S-variety in the school context suggests that a full maintenance program utilizing this variety would be met with resistance. To my knowledge T. & S.-K. (1976, 1977) did not mention varying migrant attitudes to the maintainance of Finnish through the schools.

Since the majority of im/migrant parents may support a limited use of the mother tongue in education (Brent-Palmer 1979), a program with some type of transitional format may be the most socially realistic one. The S-student would start school in the contact, or non-standard, oral variety of L1 and gradually replace it as a medium of instruction[23] with a standard variety of the mother tongue and/or D-majority language. This solution seems to reflect the S-im/migrant group's social reality. It does not, however, satisfy the pedagogical goal of educating S-children throughout the school

years in an optimal balance of a language as close as possible to the mother tongue and the majority-L in order to increase their chances of both school success and in-group identity.

All of the evidence throughout the paper suggests that the unconscious L-bias of middle-class researchers may prevent them from suggesting proposals for the language education of S-groups which are both educationally feasible and socially rewarding for the lower classes (c.f. Epstein, 1977: 65-70).

In view of the complexity of the issues, it is doubtful that researchers at this time have enough relevant information on the myriad factors that could produce socially and pedagogically satisfying outcomes of S-bilingual education. Information is urgently needed on the support for the S-languages in education;[24] degree of L-shift in the S-language community;[25] the contrast between L-language code/performance style and that of the school; as well as the ways that teaching and testing can be changed to accommodate S-children. See Fishman & Lovas (1975) for a similar set of issues. Until this type of information is known, the formulation of detailed formats for S-bilingual programs that aim at im/migrant L1 maintenance, and arguing over their relative merits is extremely premature.

FOOTNOTES

1. The marked language is the language that would not normally be used in the school as a medium of instruction and is not used in other institutions of the society. The unmarked language is normally used in all major institutions of the society, including the school, (Fishman, 1976). The abbreviation 'L' is used for language; 'L1', 'L2' for first and second languages.

2. See the following for descriptions of majority B.E. programs: Bilingual Education Project 1976: 597-605; Cohen, 1975; Cohen and Swain, 1976; Lambert and Tucker, 1972; Swain, 1974; and Swain and Barik, 1977.

3. There are in Canada some forty different minority language communities with 20,000 speakers or more (Census Canada 1971). Some of these groups have no literate tradition, others who are from literate cultures are nevertheless at various stages of literacy -- Creole-speaking West Indians, some Italians, Portuguese, and Greeks, etc. (Ashworth, 1975).

4. 52% of the students in the Toronto Board of Education jurisdiction (Toronto Board of Education, 1975); 53% in Vancouver (Vancouver Board of Education, 1975) and 39% in Montréal (Ashworth, 1975) have a language other than English (or in Montréal French) as a mother tongue. Further, according to Canale and Mougeon (1978:93) the variety of French spoken by some French-Canadians (e.g. Franco-Albertans, and Franco-Ontarians) is considered by many to be a bastardized version of standardized French. Thus, one researcher claimed that:

> les Franco-Albertains ne connaissent à fond aucune des deux langues. Ils manquent de ce fait d'un instrument fondamental pour toute créativité culturelle. (Silla, 1974, quoted in Canale and Mougeon, 1978:93).

Consequently if a Language Shelter type of program is considered for these large numbers of French-Canadian students, the number of school-aged children in such programs would be increased dramatically.

5. The term symbolic interactionism is being used in accord with Blamer (1969:2).

6. For a definition of 'power', 'sanctions' and 'conflict' see Rocher (1969:32-38).

7. Note that in the present paper linguistic code refers to the phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic levels of language. Performance/ communicative style refers to the way language is used and the values attached to that use.

8. Note that Paulston (1974:6) uses the terms language choice (status policy) and standardization (corpus policy). According to her only the latter is a part of language planning.

9. Note that elites and language policy makers do not always represent the same professional group (Paulston, 1974:7); but they are usually members of D-ethnic groups by ascription or assimilation (Kelman, 1974).

10. Often these evaluative norms are formalized in folk-theories. Consider for example, the folk belief that certain types of jobs cannot be held by S-groups because people are not intelligent enough to use L properly. (c.f. Shuy, 1973b).

11. Eakins and Eakins (1978:23-24) who observed male-female interaction claim that the following list captures the asymmetry of the type of interaction that signifies status or power differences:

Superior	Subordinate
orders or commands	complies
asks or requests	acquiesces
interrogates	replies
declares	agrees
interrupts	stops talking

12. Because there are few ethnolinguistic studies of migrant populations living in the receiving society, most of the evidence is drawn from groups who usually migrate to Northern Europe and North America or who are S-groups indigenous to North America.

13. Hymes (1974) defines a speech event as:

> activities, or aspects of activities, that are directly governed by rules or norms for the use of speech. (Hymes, 1974:52).

A private conversation is an example of a speech event. It can occur in the context of a party, a memorial service, or at school. (ibid.).

14. By a 'verbally manipulated form of speech' is meant the deliberate effort to convey multiple meanings in a single linguistic structure by means of such devices as puns, plays on words, etc. An understanding of the target meaning is dependent on either shared cultural beliefs or personal background knowledge of the speaker. (c.f. Mitchell-Kernan, 1972:317). Some speech communities seem to engage in this type of 'punning' more than others (ibid.)

15. For example, there is ethnographic evidence that instead of describing an individual's personality or character traits in a summary fashion linguistically, some Black speech communities prefer to convey such information by actually reproducing aspects of the person's speech, ranging from phonological features and grammatical peculiarities to any type of content which carries expressive value in characterizing the person. Such behaviour is recognized by members of the speech community as a specific speech genre called 'marking' (Mitchell-Kernan, 1972:333). Members of speech communities who do not habitually manipulate codified kinetic messages during speech may be perceived as cold or emotionally shallow. Differences on this point between a S-child and a D-teacher have enormous implications.

16. According to Hall (1977:92), the degree of contextualization is directly related to the degree of code elaboration. Thus Bernstein's (1973) elaborated code would typically be found in low context speech communities.

17. Witness the difference in preference for the channel of communication between Black and Anglo-North Americans. Black leaders such as Martin Luther King - a master of both kinetic messages and oral communication - never read out a speech; while both Anglo-American Presidents and Canadian Prime Ministers frequently read out their messages to the nation with a restricted kinetic style.

18. Gesellschaft societies are normally large, with highly formal organization, extensive bureaucracies and fairly specific role patterns (c.f. Perry & Perry, 1973:26-27); Gemeinschaft groups are usually small with face-to-face relations between people who share a common set of values (ibid.).

19. In my opinion, this persistence of the traditional rules for L-use and performance style in school is one of the most salient factors reinforcing the cultural barrier between D- and S- groups; and is at the base of the belief in the S-group's cognitive deficiency which is prevalent in the D- folk theories that attempt to explain S-school failure in terms of L-deficiency. See Bereiter and Engelmann (1966) as an example.

20. Further, phonological differences which distort phonemic-grahphemic correspondences can make learning to read highly problematic for speakers or contact varieties (c.f. Fishman, 1977; Labov, 1972).

21. As recently as the late 1960's there have been several reports of S-group pupils being punished for using their mother tongue which was considered

stigmatized. Children have been reprimanded in Canada (Inuit: Brant, 1977; Cree: Moore-Eyman, 1977), and in the U.S. (Navaho: Phillips, 1970, 1972; and immigrants: Gans, 1966).

22. When accounting for linguistically different childrens' low test scores, linguists have traditionally posited the importance of the mismatch at the phonological, morphological, and syntactic level between the home and test language. This type of discontinuity, however, may have relatively trivial consequences for test results when compared to the impact of the semantic mismatch and difference in communicative style. The linguists' focus may be due to the fact that until recently they tended to ignore aspects of language unrelated to a limited set of linguistic features.

23. Some type of contrastive approach may be the most effective way of introducing the S-mother tongue as a medium of instruction. The children would be taught to actively contrast the social situations in which the non-standard or standard varieties are used. Then they are taught to use them appropriately (c.f. Wolfram, 1976).

24. T.&S.-K's almost total focus on linguistic competence leads them to ignore other sociopolitical issues of im/migration. Thus, they seem to automatically assume that most migrant workers plan to return to their country of origin. Within the European context, this may have some reality. However, in the North America, retarding the learning of the D-language until immigrant children reach 12 to 14 years old may mean automatically condemning large numbers of future citizens to second class citizenship in the D- receiving society.

25. For example, one important issue not covered by the present paper is the problem of developing measures that distinguish (1) non-fluent S-children who cannot perform in the L1 because they are undergoing a process of L1 loss and shift from the S-L1 to the majority L2; (2) S-children who appear non-fluent in the L1 because they are in the process of acquiring a non-standard, contact variety as a mother tongue. Because L1-loss and L1-development often converge linguistically, (1) and (2) cannot always be distinguished from their linguistic output alone. This suggests that in order to be totally fair to the semilingual concept, one would have to isolate the few 'true semilinguals' whose L1 is in obsolescence in T.&S.-K.'s data from the pseudo-semilinguals who have a contact-dialect. I am grateful to M. Bélanger, E. Brent, and R. Mougeon for discussing these ideas with me.

REFERENCES

Abrahams, R. 1962. "Playing the dozens". Journal of American Folklore. 75:209-220.

Abrahams, R. 1972. "Joking: The training of the man of words in talking broad". In Kochman (ed.) 1972a:215-240.

Abrahams, R. and G. Geneva. 1975. "Talking Black in the classroom". In Stoller, P. (ed.) Black American English: Its Background and Its Usage. In the Schools and Literature. New York: A Delta Pub. Co.: 158-167.

Acosta-Bélan, E. 1975. "Spanglish: Case of languages in contact". In Burt, M. & N. Dulay (eds.) New Directions in Second Language Learning, Teaching and Bilingual Education: Papers of the 9th TESOL Convention, Los Angeles, Calif.:151-158.

Alleyne, M. 1976. "Dimensions and varieties of West Indian English and the implications for teaching". In D'Oyley and Silverman (eds.) Black students In Urban Canada. T.E.S.L. Talk VII.1:35-60.

Alleyne, M. 1977. "Linguistic dimensions of culture and the implications for Urban education". In D'Oyley,V. (ed.) The Impact of Multi-ethnicity on Canadian Education. Toronto: The Urban Alliance on Race Relations.

Ashworth, M. 1975. Immigrant Children and Canadian Schools. Toronto: McLelland and Stewart Ltd.

Alatis, J.(ed.) 1970. Bilingualism and Language Contact: Anthropological, Linguistic, Psychological, and Sociological Aspects. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 21st Round Table.

Baratz, J. 1970. "Educational considerations for teaching standard English to Negro Children". In Fasold, R. and R. Shuy (eds.) Teaching Standard English in the City. Washington, D.C.: Centre for Applied Linguistics: 20-40.

Baratz, J. and S. Baratz. 1975. "Early childhood intervention: The social science base of institutional racism". In Yetman, N. and C.N. Steele (eds.) Majority and Minority. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.:476-489.

Barber, C. 1973. "Trilingualism in an Arizona Yaqui village". In Paul E. Turner (ed.) Bilingualism in the Southwest. Tucson Arizona: The University of Arizona Press:295-318.

Barker, G. 1972. Social Functions of Language a Mexican American Community Tucson, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press.

Barth, F. (ed.) 1969. Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.

Bauman, R. and J. Sherzer (eds.). 1974. Explorations in the Ethnography of Speaking. London: Cambridge University Press.

Ben-Zeev, S. 1977. "Mechanisms by which childhood bilingualism affects understanding of language and cognitive structures". In Hornby, P. (ed.) Bilingualism. New York: Academic Press: 29-55.

Bereiter, C. and S. Engelman. 1966. Teaching Disavantaged Children in the Pre-School. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Bernstein, B. 1973. Class, Codes and Control. London: Paladin Books, Granada Pub. Ltd.

Bilingual Education Project. 1976. "French immersion programs in Canada". Canadian Modern Language Review 32.5:597-605.

Bloomfield, L. 1933. Language. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Blumer, H. 1969. Symbolic Interaction: Perspective and Method. Engelwood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Boggs, S. 1972."The meaning of questions and narratives to Hawaiian children". In Cazden et al. (eds.):299-327.

Bowels, S. & H. Gintis 1976. Schooling in Capitalist America. New York: Basic Books, Inc.

Brant, C. 1977. "Education for Canadian Eskimos". In Carlton, R.A. et al. (eds.) Education, Change and Society: The Sociology of Canadian Education. Toronto: Gage Educational Planning Ltd.:173-182.

Brent, E. 1974. "Social and objective language norms: A French Canadian illustration". Paper presented at the Spring Conference of the Niagara Linguistics Society, Buffalo, New York.

Brent-Palmer, C. 1977. "Language as social control and cultural conflict: The language adjustment problems of Black youths in Canadian schools". Talk presented at the Fourth National Congress of Black Women of Canada, August, Windsor, Ontario.

Brent-Palmer, C. 1978. "Language variability and the problem of establishing pedagogical norms for successful learning: Toward socially realistic criteria". M.A. thesis, University of Toronto, Ontario.

Brent-Palmer, C. 1979. "Immigrant versus governmental perspectives of vernacular education programs in Canada: Three conflicting views". Unpublished M.S.

Breton, R. 1977. "The assimilation of New Canadians". Talk given at the 11th Annual Conference for TESL, OISE, Toronto. October 20-22.

Bubernik, V. 1978. "The acquisition of Czech in the English environment". In Paradis, M. (ed.) Aspects of Bilingualism. Columbia, South Carolina: Hornbeam Press Inc.:3-12.

Canale, M. and R. Mougeon. 1978. "Problèmes posés par la mesure du rendement en français des élèves franco-ontariens". In Working Papers on Bilingualism. no. 16: 92-110.

Cazden, C. 1970. "The situation: A neglected source of social class differences in language use". Journal of Social Issues. 26.2: 35-60.

Cazden, C. 1973. "Problems for education: Language as curriculum content and learning environment". Craubard, S. (ed.) Language as a Human Problem. Daedalus. 102.3:135-148.

Cazden, C., V. John and D. Hymes (eds.) 1972. Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press.

Cicourel, A. 1972. "Basic and normative rules in the negotiation of status and role". In Sudnow (ed.):229-258.

Cicourel, A. 1974. "Some Basic theoretical issues in the assessment of the child's performance in testing and classroom settings". In Cicourel et al. (eds.):300-365.

Cicourel, A.V. et al. (eds.) 1974. Language Use and School Performance. New York: Academic Press.

Cohen, A. 1974. "The Culver City Spanish immersion program: The first two years". The Modern Language Journal. 58.3:95-103.

Cohen, A. 1975. A Sociolinguistic Approach To Bilingual Education. Rowley Mass.: Newbury House.

Cohen, A.D. and M. Swain. 1976. "Bilingualism education: The 'Immersion' model in North American Context". TESOL Quarterly. 10.1:45-53.

Cohen, R. 1973. "Conceptual styles, culture conflict and nonverbal tests of intelligence". In Ianni F. and E. Storey (Eds.) Cultural Relevance and Educational Issues. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.: 495-527.

Craig, D. 1971. "Education and creole English in the West Indies: Some sociolinguistic factors". In Hymes, D. (ed.) Pidginization and Creolization of Language. Cambridge University Press.

Craig, D. 1976. "Bidialectal education: Creole and standard in the West Indies". International Journal of the Sociology of Language. 8: 93-4.

Cummins, J. 1976. "The influence of bilingualism on cognitive growth: A synthesis of research findings and explanatory hypotheses". Working Papers on Bilingualism. 9:1-43.

Cummins, J. 1977. "Cognitive factors associated with the attainment of intermediate levels of bilingual skills". Modern Language Journal. 61.1-2:3-12.

Cummins, J. 1978a. "Educational implications of mother tongue maintenance in minority language groups". Canadian Modern Language Review. 34.3:395-416.

Cummins, J. 1978b. "Bilingualism and minority groups". Unpublished M.S.

Cummins, J. 1979. "Linguistic interdependence and the educational development of bilingual children". Review of Educational Research. (in press).

Deutsch, K. 1975. "The political significance of linguistic conflicts". In Savard, J.-G. and Vigneault, R. (eds.) Les Etats Multilingues: Problèmes et Solutions. Laval, P.Q.: Les Presses de l'Université Laval:7-28.

Dittmar, N. 1976. Sociolinguistics: A Critical Survey of Theory and Application. London: Edward Arnold.

Dumont, R. 1972. "Learning English and how to be silent: Studies in Sioux and Cherokee classrooms". In Cazden et al. (eds.):344-369.

Eakins, B. and G. Eakins. 1978. Sex Differences and Human Communication. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Co.

Edwards, A. 1976. Language in Culture and Class: The Sociology of Language and Education. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

Eidheim, H. 1969. "When ethnic identity is a social stigma". In Barth, F. (ed.) Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. Boston: Little, Brown and Co.:38-57.

Epstein, N. 1977. Language, Ethnicity, and the Schools: Policy Alternatives for Bilingual-Bicultural Education. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Erickson, F. 1969. "Discussion behaviour in the Black ghetto and in White suburbia: A comparison of language style and inquiry style". Ph.D. dissertation, Northwestern University.

Ervin-Tripp, S. 1977. "Wait for me, Roller Skate!". In Ervin-Tripp, S. and C. Mitchell-Kernan (eds.) Child Discourse. New York: Academic Press:165-188.

Farb, P. 1974. Word Play: What Happens When People Talk. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Fishman, J. 1974. "Language planning and language planning research". In Fishman, J.A. (ed.) Advances in Language Planning. The Hogue: Mouton and Co.

Fishman, J. 1976. Bilingual Education: An International Sociological Perspective. Rowley Mass.: Newbury House.

Fishman, J. 1977. "Standard" versus 'dialect' in bilingual education: An old problem in a new context". Modern Language Journal. XLI.7:315-24.

Fishman, J. and J. Lovas. 1972. "Bilingual education in a sociolinguistic perspective". In Spolsky, B. (ed.) The Language Education of Minority Children. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.83-93.

Gaarder, A. 1971. "Language maintenance and language shift: The prospect for Spanish in the U.S.". Paper presented at the Child Language Conference, Chicago, November 22-24.

Gans, H. 1962. The Urban Villagers: Group and Class Life of Italian-Americans. New York: Free Press.

Garfinkel, H. 1972. "Studies of the routine grounds of everyday activities". In Sudnow (ed.):1-30.

Gelfand, D. 1973. "Ethnic relations and social research: A reevaluation". In Gelfand and Lee (eds.):1-18.

Gelfand, D. and R. Lee. (eds.) 1973. Ethnic Conflict and Power: A Cross-National Perspective. New York or Toronto: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Giles, H. and P. Powesland. 1975. Speech Style and Social Evaluation. London: Academic Press.

Goffman, E. 1959. The Presentation of Self In Everyday Life. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Goffman, E. 1963. Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Goffman, E. 1972. "The neglected situation". In Paolo Giglioli (ed.) Language and Social Context. Middlesex, England: Penguin Books Ltd.:61-66.

Goossens, M. 1973. "Degree of bilingualism among Dutch immigrants in Calgary". In Darnell, R. (ed.) Canadian Languages in their Social Context. Edmonton: Linguistic Research, Inc.:151-156.

Grabowski, Y. 1975. "Languages in contact: Polish and English". In Migus, P. (ed.) Sound Canadian: Languages and Cultures in Multi-Ethnic Society. Toronto: Peter Martin Associates Ltd.: 59-68.

Gumperz, J. 1971. "The relation of linguistic to social categories". In Anwar S. Dil (ed.) Language in Social Groups. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press:220-229.

Gumperz, J. and E. Hernandez-Chavez 1972. "Bilingualism, bidialectalism and classroom interaction". In Cazden et al. (eds.):84-108.

Gumperz, J. and E. Herasimchuk. 1972. "The conversational analysis of social meaning: A study of classroom interaction". In Shuy, R. (ed.) Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press:99-134.

Hall, E. 1977. Beyond Culture. Garden City, New York: Anchor Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1973. Explorations in the Functions of Language. Explorations in Language Study. London: Butler and Tanner Ltd.

Handscombe, J. 1978. "English as a second language/dialect". Talk given at Conference on Bilingualism in Education: Section III of the University Lunch and Learn Series. Innis College, Toronto, February 10 - March 3.

Hasan, R. 1976. "Socialization and cross-cultural education". International Journal of the Sociology of Language. 8:7-25.

Haugen, E. 1972. The Ecology of Language: Essays by Einar Haugen. Selected by Anwar S. Dil. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Haugen, E. 1977. "Norm and deviation in bilingual communities". In Hornby (ed.):91-102.

Hoffman, G. 1971. "Puerto Ricans in New York". In Fishman et al. (eds.) Bilingualism in the Barrio. The Hague, Netherlands: Mouton and Co.

Hornby, P. (ed.) 1977. Bilingualism: Psychological, Social and Educational Implications. New York: Academic Press Inc.

Hughes, D.R. and E. Kallen. 1974. The anatomy of Racism: Canadian Dimensions. Montréal, Harvest House.

Hymes, Dell. 1970. "Bilingual Education: Linguistic versus sociolinguistic bases". In Alatis,J. (ed.) Bilingualism and Language Contact: 69-76.

Hymes, Dell. 1972. "Models of the interaction of language and social life". Gumperz, J. et al. (eds.) Directions in Sociolinguistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Hymes, Dell, 1974. Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach. Philadelphia: University of Penn.

Jackson, J. 1977. "The functions of language in Canada: On the political economy of language". In Coons, W. (ed.) The Individual, Language and Society: Scope and Definition. Ottawa: Canada Council/ Conseil des Arts du Canada:61-76.

John, V. 1972. "Styles of learning - styles of teaching: Reflections on the education of the Navajo children". In Cazden et al. (eds.):331-343.

John, V. 1973. "Sociolinguistic perspectives and education". In Shuy, R. (ed.) Sociolinguistics:Current Trends and Prospects. Report of the Twenty-Third Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies. Monograph Series on Language and Linguistics. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University:223-235.

Kaplan, R. 1966. "Cultural thought patterns in intercultural education". Language Learning. 16:1-20.

Karttunen, F. 1977. "Finnish in America: A case study in monogenerational language change". In Blount, B.G. and M. Sanches (eds.) Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Change. New York: Academic Press:173-184.

Kay, P. 1977. "Language evolution and speech style". In Blount, B.G. and M. Sanches (eds.) Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Change. New York: Academic Press: 21-33.

Kelman, H. 1971. "Language as an aid and barrier to involvement in the national system". In Rubin, J. and Jernudd, B. (eds.) Can Language Be Planned? Honolulu: The University Pess of Hawaii:21-51.

Kernan, K., Sodergren, J. and R. French. 1977. "Speech and social prestige in the Belizian speech community". In Blount, B.G. and Sanches, M. (eds.) Sociocultural Dimensions of Language Change. New York: Academic Press:35-50.

Kochman, T. 1972. "Black American speech events and a language program for the classroom". In Cazden et al. (eds.):211-261.

Kochman, T. (ed.) 1972a. Rappin' and Stylin' Out: Communication in Urban Black America. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Labov, W. 1972a. Language in the Inner City: Studies in Black English vernacular. Philadelphia: University of Penn. Press.

Labov, W. 1972b. Sociolinguistic Patterns. Philadelphia: University of Penn. Press.

Lambert, W. 1975. "Culture and language as factors of learning in education". In Wolfgang, Aaron (ed.) Education of Immigrant Students: Issues and Answers. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Lambert, W. and G.R. Tucker. 1972. Bilingual Education of Children. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Lenski, G. 1966. Power and Privilege: A Theory of Social Stratification New York: McGraw-Hill.

Leodolter, R. and M. Leodolter. 1976. "Sociolinguistic considerations on psychosocialization: The beginnings of a theory of verbalization". In McCormack, W. and S.A. Wurm (eds.) Language and Man: Anthropological Issues:323-344.

Lewis, M. and L. Cherry. 1977. "Social behaviour and language acquisition". In Lewis, M. and L. Rosenblum (eds.) Interaction, Conversation and the Development of Language. Toronto: John Wiley and Sons:227-245.

McDermott, K. 1974. "Achieving school failure: An anthropological approach to illiteracy and social stratification". In Spindler (ed.):82-118.

McKay, W. 1972. Puissance, attraction et pression des langues en contact: Modèles et indices. Laval, Québec: Centre internationale de researches sur le bilinguisme.

MacKinnon, K. 1977. Language Education and Social Processes in a Gaelic Community. London: Routledge and Paul Kagen.

Marden, C. and G. Meyer. 1968. Minorities in American Society. Toronto: Van Nostrand Reinhold Co.

Martin, W. and A. McDonald. 1978. Canadian Education: A Sociological Analysis. Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall of Canada.

Mead, G. 1962. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Mehan, H. 1974. "Accomplishing classroom lessons". In Cicourel et al.:76-142.

Mehan, H. 1977. "Ethnography". Perspectives on Bilingualism: The Social Sciences.

Memmi, A. 1972. Portrait du colonisé. Montréal: L'Etincelle.

Mitchell-Kernan, C. 1972. "Signifying, loud-talking and marking". In Kochman (ed.) 1972a:315-335.

Moore-Egman, E. 1977. "A university's search for a system of delivering basic skills to Canadian Native Peoples - A concurrent approach". In D'Oyley, D. (ed.) The Impact of Multi-Ethnicity on Canadian Education. Toronto: The Urban Alliance on Race Relations, 129-146.

Mougeon, R. 1978. "Bilingual versus French language schools: A study of parental expectations among Franco-Ontarians". Article presented at the IXth World Congress of Sociology held at Uppsala (Sweden). August 14-19, 1978.

Olson, D. 1977. "From utterance to text: The bias of language in speech and writing". Harvard Educational Review. 47:257-281.

Parker, L. 1978. "Current perspectives". In Bilingual Education: Current Perspectives Synthesis. Vol. 5. Arlington, Va: Center for Applied Linguistics:1-62.

Paulston, C. 1974. Implications of Language Learning Theory for Language Planning: Concerns in Bilingual Education. Arlington, Va: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Paulston, C. 1975. "Ethnic relations and bilingual education: Accounting for contradictory data". Working Papers on Bilingualism, 6:1-44.

Paulston, C. 1977. "Theoretical perspectives on bilingual education programs". Working Papers on Bilingualism, 13:130-177.

Perry, J. and E. Perry. 1973. The Social Web: An Introduction to Sociology. New York: Harper and Row.

Phillips, S. 1970. "Acquisition of rules for appropriate speech usage". In Alatis (ed.):77-110.

Phillips, S. 1972. "Participant structures and communicative competence: Warm Spring children in community and classroom". In Cazden et al. (eds.):370-394.

Regan, G. 1977. "Socialization outcomes and processes in Canadian schools". In Carlton, R. et al. (eds.) Education, Change and Society: A Sociology of Canadian Education. Toronto: Gage Pub. Ltd.

Roberts, J. and S. Akinsanga. (eds.) 1975. Schooling in the Cultural Context: Anthropological Studies of Education. New York: David McKay.

Robinson, W. 1971. "Restricted codes in sociolinguistics and the sociology of education". In Whiteley, W. (ed.) Language Use and Social Change. London: Oxford University Press.

Rocher, G. 1969. Introduction à la sociologie générale: Tome 1: L'action sociale. Montréal: Editions Hurtuboise HMN, Ltée.

Rodman, L. and I. Deglavs-Brenzinger. 1973. "Aspects of English-Latvian language contact". In Darnell, R. (ed.) Canadian Languages in their Social Context. Edmonton: Linguistic Research, Inc.: 129-149.

Rubin, J. 1976. "How to tell when someone is saying 'no'". Topics in Culture Learning. 4:61-65

Ryan , W. 1971. "Blaming the victim: The folklore of cultural deprivation". In This Magazine is about Schools.

Samovar, L.A. and A. Porter. 1972. Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Pub. Co. Inc.

Schermerhorn, R.A. 1970. Comparative Ethnic Relations: A Framework for Theory and Research. New York: Random House.

Shuy, R. 1973b. "Language and success: Who are the judges? In Bailey, R. and L. Robinson (eds.) Varieties of Present-Day English. New York: Macmillan.

Shuy, R. 1973. (ed.). Sociolinguistics: Current Trends and Prospects. Washington: Georgetown University Press. 23 Round Table.

Simoes, A. 1976 (ed.). The Bilingual Child: Research and Analysis of Existing Educational Themes. New York: Academic Press.

Sinclair, J. and R. Coulthard. 1975. Towards an Analysis of Discourse: The English Used By Teachers and Pupils. London: Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. et al. 1972. The English Used By Teachers and Pupils. Final Report to SSRC.

Sociolinguistics: A Cross disciplinary Perspective. 1971. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Spindler, G. 1974. "Why have minority groups in North America been disadvantaged by their schools? In Spindler (ed.):69-81.

Spindler, G. 1974 (ed.). Education and Cultural Process: Toward an Anthropology of Education. Toronto: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Stockfelt-Hoaton, B. 1975. "The teaching of bilingual infant immigrants in a Swedish town". In Roberts and Akinsanga (eds.):119-125.

Sudnow, D. 1972. Studies in Social Interaction. New York: The Free Press.

Swain, M. 1974. "French Immersion programs across Canada: Research findings". Canadian Modern Language Review. 31.2:117-129.

Swain, M. in press. "Home-school language switching". In Richards, J.C. (ed.). Understanding Second Language Learning: Issues and Approaches. Rowley, Mass.; Newbury House.

Swain, M. and H.C. Barik. 1976. "Bilingual education for the English Canadians: Recent developments". In Simoes (ed.):91-111.

Tajfel, H. 1974. "Social identity and intergroup behaviour". Social Science Information. 13:65-93.

Toelkan, B. 1971. "Cultural bilingualism and composition: Native American education at the university of Oregon". English for American Indians: 29-32.

Toronto Board of Education. 1976. Final Report of the Work Group on Multicultural Programs.

Toukomaa, P. and T. Skutnabb-Kangas. 1976. Teaching Migrant Children's Mother Tongue and Learning the Language of the Host Country in the Context of the Sociocultural Situation of the Migrant Family. University of Tampere, Finland.

Toukomaa, P. and T. Skutnabb-Kangas. 1977. The Intensive Teaching of the Mother Tongue to Migrant Children at Pre-School Age. University of Tampere, UNESCO. Tutkimusia Research Reports

Urion, C. 1971. "A German-English interlingual 'key'". In Darnell, R. (ed.) Linguistic Diversity in Canadian Society. Edmonton: Linguistic Research, Inc.:223-230.

Valencia, A. 1975. "A philosophical-psychological perspective on linguistic variances found among Spanish-Speaking Americans". In Dulay and Burt (eds.) New Directions in Second Language Learning, Teaching and Bilingual Education. Papers of the 9th TESOL Convention Los Angeles, California.

Vallee, F. 1975. "Multi-ethnic societies: The issues of identity and inequality" in Forcese and Richer (eds.) Issues in Canadian Society: An Introduction:162-202.

Vancouver School Board. 1975. Report of the Task Force on English. Educational Services Group.

Ward, M. 1971. Them children: A Study of Language Learning. CSEC: New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Weinreich, U. 1953. Languages in Contact. New York: The Linguistic Circle of New York.

Wolfram, W. 1976. "Levels of sociolinguistic bias in testing". In Harrison and Trabasso (eds.) Black English: A Seminar. New York: John Wiley and Sons.